

Exact solution at integrable coupling of a model for the Josephson effect between small metallic grains

Jon Links*, Huan-Qiang Zhou, Ross H. McKenzie⁺ and Mark D. Gould

*Centre for Mathematical Physics,
The University of Queensland, 4072,
Australia*

**email: jrl@maths.uq.edu.au*

⁺Also at Centre for Quantum Computing Technology, The University of Queensland.

Abstract

A model is introduced for two reduced BCS systems which are coupled through the transfer of Cooper pairs between the systems. The model may thus be used in the analysis of the Josephson effect arising from pair tunneling between two strongly coupled small metallic grains. At a particular coupling strength the model is integrable and explicit results are derived for the energy spectrum, conserved operators, integrals of motion, and wave function scalar products. It is also shown that form factors can be obtained for the calculation of correlation functions. Further, a connection with perturbed conformal field theory is made.

1. Introduction.

The study of superconductivity in metallic nanoparticles is of fundamental scientific interest and is the basis of several proposed solid state quantum computers [1]. The experimental work of Ralph, Black and Tinkham [2] has stimulated a wealth of theoretical activity concerning the reduced BCS Hamiltonian describing electron pairing correlations in systems with discrete energy levels and a fixed number of electrons. For sufficiently small systems the energy level spacing becomes comparable to the energy gap predicted by the BCS mean-field approximation making mean-field theory unreliable because of the large superconducting fluctuations [3].

These considerations are also relevant to proposals to observe BCS superconductivity in gases of fermionic atoms such as spin-polarised ${}^6\text{Li}$ [4]. Quantum degeneracy of ${}^6\text{Li}$ at temperatures of about 240 nK has recently been observed in an atom trap with frequencies, $\omega \sim 1$ kHz [5], corresponding to an energy level spacing of the order of 10^{-12} eV. The estimated BCS transition temperature is of the order of 20 nK [4], corresponding to an energy gap of the order of 4×10^{-12} eV, comparable to the energy level spacing.

The failure of approximation schemes increases the importance of the fact that the reduced BCS Hamiltonian is exactly solvable [6]. Furthermore, it is integrable [7], and has a rich mathematical structure [8, 9, 10]. The integrability of the model has recently been clarified by the Quantum Inverse Scattering Method (QISM) and algebraic Bethe ansatz [9, 10]. This has the advantage that it makes accessible the computation of form factors and correlation functions [8, 9]. This realisation makes it clear that these techniques can be used to study more general classes of pairing models. For example, the coupled pairing model which accomodates proton-neutron pairing in nuclear systems studied by Richardson [11] can be formulated via the QISM utilizing the $so(5)$ symmetry algebra [12]. Other examples are discussed in [13, 14].

For a single metallic grain, due to the fixed and finite number of electrons there is no breaking of gauge symmetry and no long-range superconducting order. Consequently, an important question concerns the existence and nature of the Josephson effect [15] between two coupled metallic grains. If the number of pairs of electrons N in each grain is fixed, then for very weak intergrain coupling there is no Josephson effect [16]. On the other hand, if one constructs a qubit consisting of a coherent superposition of N and $N + 1$ pairs in an individual grain, Josephson tunneling occurs and can be used to couple qubits together [1, 16].

In this article we introduce a model describing the tunneling of Cooper pairs between two metallic grains described by reduced BCS models. We show that for a particular value of the intergrain coupling the model is inte-

grable and has an underlying $\text{so}(3)$ symmetry which we exploit to solve the model by the algebraic Bethe ansatz. First we consider the physical basis of the model, stressing that it requires a large intergrain coupling.

2. Model Hamiltonian.

The physical properties of each metallic grain are described by the reduced BCS Hamiltonian [3]

$$H_{BCS}(q) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \epsilon_j n_j(q) - g \sum_{j,k} b_k^\dagger(q) b_j(q)$$

with $q = 1, 2$. Above, $j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{L}$ labels a shell of doubly degenerate single particle energy levels with energies ϵ_j and n_j is the fermion number operator for level j . The operators $b_j \equiv c_{j,\uparrow} c_{j,\downarrow}$ and $b_j^\dagger$ are the annihilation and creation operators for the Cooper pairs and satisfy the hard-core boson relations

$$(b_j^\dagger)^2 = 0, \quad [b_j, b_k^\dagger] = \delta_{jk}(1 - 2b_j^\dagger b_j) \\ [b_j, b_k] = [b_j^\dagger, b_k^\dagger] = 0, \quad \text{for } k \neq j.$$

One of the prominent features of this Hamiltonian is the *blocking effect*. For any unpaired electron at level j the action of the pairing interaction is zero since only paired electrons are scattered. This means that the Hilbert space can be decoupled into orthogonal subspaces of paired and unpaired electrons in which the action of the Hamiltonian on the subspace for the unpaired electrons is automatically diagonal in the natural basis. Consequently, we need only focus on the subspace of paired electrons when solving for the spectrum of the model.

In order to firmly establish a microscopic basis for Josephson's proposal [17, 18] of Cooper pair tunneling through an insulating barrier between two bulk superconductors, Anderson [16], and Ambegaokar and Baratoff [19], studied the Hamiltonian

$$H = H_{BCS}(1) + H_{BCS}(2) - \sum_{j,k,\sigma} t_{jk} \left(c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger(1) c_{k,\sigma}(2) + c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger(2) c_{k,\sigma}(1) \right). \quad (1)$$

They treated the effect of the tunneling to second-order in t_{jk} and the BCS Hamiltonians were treated at the mean-field level in the grand-canonical ensemble. If we define $\Delta \exp(i\phi(q)) \equiv g \sum_j \langle c_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger(q) c_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger(q) \rangle$ then the Josephson current is proportional to $t^2 \Delta \sin(\phi(1) - \phi(2))$ where $t^2 \equiv \sum_{j,k} |t_{jk}|^2$. One is then justified in writing the effective Hamiltonian

$$H = H_{BCS}(1) + H_{BCS}(2) - \epsilon_J \sum_{j,k}^{\mathcal{L}} \left(b_j^\dagger(1) b_k(2) + b_j^\dagger(2) b_k(1) \right) \quad (2)$$

where ε_J is the Josephson coupling energy.

If one repeats the calculation with $N(1)$ and $N(2)$ fixed and finite then to second-order in the tunneling matrix element there is no Josephson coupling because $\langle c_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger(q)c_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger(q) \rangle = 0$ for both $q = 1, 2$. However, if the intergrain coupling is sufficiently large that we go beyond second-order in t then only $N(1) + N(2)$ is a good quantum number, and not $N(1)$ and $N(2)$ individually. It is then possible that $\langle c_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger(q)c_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger(q) \rangle \neq 0$ and so it is appropriate to study a Hamiltonian of the form (2).

The Hamiltonian (2) is not integrable for arbitrary values of the coupling parameters g and ε_J . We demonstrate below that for the particular choice $\varepsilon_J = g$ the model does become integrable and an exact solution can be obtained. In typical Josephson junctions involving spatially separated superconductors that are separated by an insulating barrier, $\varepsilon_J \ll g$. However, this does not rule out fabrication of a junction consisting of two metallic grains separated by a quantum point contact with a transmission coefficient close to one. Because of the tunability of the pairing interaction in trapped atom systems, as noted in [5], the case of (relatively) strong Josephson coupling between such systems may be feasible. These systems also admit the possibility of an “internal” Josephson junction which does not involve spatially separated condensates [20].

3. Integrable coupling model.

As in the case of a single BCS system, the model (2) exhibits the blocking effect for unpaired electrons. However, the model with $\varepsilon_J = g$ displays an additional blocking effect which we now elucidate. We begin by writing the Hamiltonian in an equivalent form

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \varepsilon_j n_j - g \sum_{j,k}^{\mathcal{L}} (b_j^\dagger(1) + b_j^\dagger(2))(b_k(1) + b_k(2)) \quad (3)$$

where $n_j = n_j(1) + n_j(2)$. The pairing interaction cannot scatter any antisymmetric state of the form

$$|\Psi_j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_j^\dagger(1) - b_j^\dagger(2)) |0\rangle$$

since an elementary calculation shows that

$$(b_k(1) + b_k(2)) |\Psi_j\rangle = 0$$

for all k and j . A consequence of the blocking effect for antisymmetric pairs is that the Hilbert space now decomposes into subspaces where the pairing

interaction is non-trivial on the local states spanned by

$$\begin{aligned} |1\rangle &= b^\dagger(1)b^\dagger(2)|0\rangle, \\ |2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b^\dagger(1) + b^\dagger(2))|0\rangle, \\ |3\rangle &= |0\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for each level j . We will denote this space V_j . Hence the problem of diagonalizing the Hamiltonian is reduced to diagonalizing the Hamiltonian over the product of these subspaces. This will be achieved below using the algebraic Bethe ansatz and the spin 1 representation of the $so(3)$ Lie algebra. The procedure is analogous to that employed in Ref. [9, 10] for the standard reduced BCS model involving $su(2)$.

The hard-core bosons provide a spin 1 representation of $so(3)$ through

$$S^+ = (b^\dagger(1) + b^\dagger(2)), \quad S^- = (b(1) + b(2)), \quad S^z = N - 1 \quad (4)$$

where $N = N(1) + N(2)$ counts the number of Cooper pairs. Associated with the spin 1 representation there is a solution of the Yang-Baxter equation

$$R_{12}(u - v)L_1(u)L_2(v) = L_2(v)L_1(u)R_{12}(u - v)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} R(u) &= I \otimes I + \frac{\eta}{u} \sum_{m,n=1}^2 e_n^m \otimes e_m^n, \\ L(u) &= I \otimes I + \frac{\eta}{u} (e_1^1 \otimes S^z - e_2^2 \otimes S^z + e_2^1 \otimes S^- + e_1^2 \otimes S^+) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_n^m\}$ are 2×2 matrices with 1 in the (m, n) entry and zeroes elsewhere. Above, I is the identity operator and η is a scaling parameter for the rapidity variable u which plays an important role in the subsequent analysis. With this solution we construct the transfer matrix

$$t(u) = \text{tr}_0 (G_0 L_{0\mathcal{L}}(u - \epsilon_{\mathcal{L}}) \dots L_{01}(u - \epsilon_1)) \quad (5)$$

which is an operator on the subspace $V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes \dots \otimes V_{\mathcal{L}}$ on which the pairing interaction acts non-trivially. Above, we have introduced an auxiliary space V_0 and tr_0 denotes the trace taken over this space. Moreover $G = \exp(\alpha\eta\sigma)$ with $\sigma = \text{diag}(1, -1)$. A consequence of the Yang-Baxter equation is that $[t(u), t(v)] = 0$ for all values of the parameters u and v . Defining

$$T_j = \lim_{u \rightarrow \epsilon_j} \frac{u - \epsilon_j}{\eta^2} t(u)$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{L}$, we may write in the *quasi-classical limit* $T_j = \tau_j + o(\eta)$ and it follows that

$$[\tau_j, \tau_k] = 0, \quad \forall j, k.$$

Explicitly, these operators read

$$\tau_j = 2\alpha S_j^z + \sum_{k \neq j}^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{\theta_{jk}}{\epsilon_j - \epsilon_k} \quad (6)$$

with $\theta = S^+ \otimes S^- + S^- \otimes S^+ + 2S^z \otimes S^z$. It is an algebraic exercise to show that the Hamiltonian (3) can be expressed as

$$H = -g \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \epsilon_j \tau_j + g^3/4 \sum_{j,k}^{\mathcal{L}} \tau_j \tau_k + 2 \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \epsilon_j + g^2/2 \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \tau_j - 2g\mathcal{L} \quad (7)$$

with $g = -1/\alpha$ and the elements of $so(3)$ represented through (4). This shows that the Hamiltonian is integrable since it is clear that $[H, \tau_j] = 0, \forall j$.

4. Exact solution.

A standard calculation (e.g., see [21]) gives that the eigenvalues of the transfer matrix (5) take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(u) = & \exp(\alpha\eta) \prod_k^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{u - \epsilon_k + \eta}{u - \epsilon_k} \prod_j^M \frac{u - w_j - \eta}{u - w_j} \\ & + \exp(-\alpha\eta) \prod_k^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{u - \epsilon_k - \eta}{u - \epsilon_k} \prod_j^M \frac{u - w_j + \eta}{u - w_j} \end{aligned}$$

where the parameters w_j are required to satisfy the Bethe ansatz equations

$$\exp(2\alpha\eta) \prod_k^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{w_l - \epsilon_k + \eta}{w_l - \epsilon_k - \eta} = - \prod_j^M \frac{w_l - w_j + \eta}{w_l - w_j - \eta}.$$

The eigenvalues of the conserved operators (6) are obtained through the leading terms of the expansion of the transfer matrix eigenvalues in the parameter η . This yields the result

$$\lambda_j = \frac{-2}{g} + \sum_{k \neq j}^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{\epsilon_j - \epsilon_k} - \sum_i^M \frac{2}{\epsilon_j - v_i}$$

such that the parameters v_j satisfy the coupled algebraic equations

$$\frac{-2}{g} + \sum_k^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{v_j - \epsilon_k} = \sum_{i \neq j}^M \frac{2}{v_j - v_i} \quad (8)$$

which are analogous to Richardson's equations [6] for the reduced BCS model. Through (7), the energy eigenvalues are found to be

$$E = 4 \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \epsilon_j - 2 \sum_j^M v_j + 2g(M - \mathcal{L}).$$

We introduce a set of states of the form

$$|\vec{w}, M\rangle \equiv |w_1, \dots, w_M\rangle = \prod_j^M B(w_j) |\Phi\rangle \quad (9)$$

where $|\Phi\rangle$ is the completely filled state with $2\mathcal{L}$ Cooper pairs and

$$B(u) = \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{S_j^-}{u - \epsilon_j}.$$

Note that these operators are mutually commuting for different values of u . In general we find that

$$\tau_j |\vec{w}, M\rangle = \lambda_j |\vec{w}, M\rangle - \sum_{\alpha}^M \frac{f_{\alpha} S_j^-}{\epsilon_j - w_{\alpha}} |\vec{w}, M\rangle'_{\alpha}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$f_{\alpha} = \frac{2}{g} + \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha}^M \frac{2}{w_{\alpha} - w_{\beta}} - \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{w_{\alpha} - \epsilon_j} \quad (11)$$

and λ_j is understood to be a function of the parameters w_i . In (10) we defined $|\vec{w}, M\rangle'_{\alpha}$ by

$$|\vec{w}, M\rangle = \sum_j^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{S_j^-}{w_{\alpha} - \epsilon_j} |\vec{w}, M\rangle'_{\alpha}.$$

Imposing $f_{\alpha} = 0$, one immediately sees that $|\vec{w}, M\rangle$ becomes the eigenvector of the integrals of motion τ_j with λ_j as the eigenvalue. The constraint $f_{\alpha} = 0$ is then equivalent to (8). For a given solution of (8), the corresponding eigenstate has $2\mathcal{L} - M$ Cooper pairs.

5. Connection to conformal field theory.

Introduce the function $\chi(v, \epsilon) = \chi(v_1, \dots, v_N, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N)$ obeying the following differential relations

$$\kappa \frac{d\chi(v, \epsilon)}{d\epsilon_j} = \lambda_j \chi(v, \epsilon), \quad \kappa \frac{d\chi(v, \epsilon)}{dv_{\alpha}} = f_{\alpha} \chi(v, \epsilon), \quad (12)$$

where $\kappa = (k + 2)/2$. It is easy to check that the zero curvature conditions are fulfilled:

$$\frac{d\lambda_j}{dv_\alpha} = \frac{df_\alpha}{d\epsilon_j}.$$

The solution of (12) is

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(v, \epsilon) = & \exp \left(-\frac{2}{g\kappa} \sum_j \epsilon_j + \frac{2}{g\kappa} \sum_\alpha v_\alpha \right) \prod_{i < j} (\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)^{\frac{2}{\kappa}} \\ & \times \prod_{\alpha < \beta} (v_\alpha - v_\beta)^{\frac{2}{\kappa}} \prod_{j < \alpha} (\epsilon_j - v_\alpha)^{-\frac{2}{\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

The function defined through multiple contour integrals

$$\Phi(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N) = \oint \dots \oint \chi(v, \epsilon) \psi(v, \epsilon) dv_1 \dots dv_N \quad (13)$$

generates a solution to the (perturbed) Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (KZ) equation [22]

$$\kappa \frac{d\Phi}{d\epsilon_j} = \tau_j \Phi.$$

This constitutes a generalization of the solutions of the KZ equation found in [23] (see also, [24, 25, 26]). It should be stressed that the perturbed KZ equation is understood in the sense of perturbed conformal field theory [27]. That is, the conformal invariance is broken once the term $-2S_j^z/g$ is included. The above construction is an extension of the corresponding results for the BCS model, which is equivalent to Sierra's free field realization of the $su(2)_k$ WZNW model [28]. As Sierra noted for the BCS model, the on-shell eigenvalue of the integrals of motion of the model follows from the saddle point approximation in the singular limit $k = -2$.

6. Scalar products and norms.

There is an elegant result due to Slavnov [29, 30, 31] which gives a determinant representation for the scalar product of an eigenstate of the transfer matrix (5) with an arbitrary state. In the quasiclassical limit, the leading terms in η of Slavnov's scalar product gives rise to the scalar product of the states of this model yielding the result

$$\langle \vec{w}, M | \vec{v}, M \rangle = \frac{\prod_{\beta=1}^M \prod_{\substack{\alpha=1 \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^M (v_\beta - w_\alpha)}{\prod_{\beta < \alpha} (w_\beta - w_\alpha) \prod_{\alpha < \beta} (v_\beta - v_\alpha)} \det_M J(\{v_\alpha\}, \{w_\beta\}),$$

where the matrix elements of J are given by

$$J_{ab} = \frac{v_b - w_b}{v_a - w_b} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{(v_a - \epsilon_j)(w_b - \epsilon_j)} - \sum_{\alpha \neq a}^M \frac{2}{(v_a - v_\alpha)(w_b - v_\alpha)} \right). \quad (14)$$

Here $\{v_\alpha\}$ are a solution to the equations (8), whereas $\{w_\beta\}$ are arbitrary parameters. Specializing $\{w_b\} = \{v_a\}$ for a solution to (8) gives the square of the norm of the corresponding eigenvector (9),

$$\langle \vec{v}, M | \vec{v}, M \rangle = \det_M K, \quad (15)$$

where the matrix elements of K are given by

$$K_{aa} = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{(v_a - \epsilon_j)^2} - \sum_{\alpha \neq a}^M \frac{2}{(v_a - v_\alpha)^2},$$

$$K_{ab} = \frac{2}{(v_a - v_b)^2}. \quad (16)$$

7. Correlation functions and form factors.

For any operator χ and state $|\vec{w}, M\rangle$ the correlation function is defined

$$C(\chi, \vec{w}, M) = \frac{\langle \vec{w}, M | \chi | \vec{w}, M \rangle}{\langle \vec{w}, M | \vec{w}, M \rangle}$$

Of particular interest in the present case are the correlation functions for the intergrain current operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j} &= i[H, \sum_j n_j(1) - n_j(2)] \\ &= 2ig \sum_{j,k} \left(b_j^\dagger(1) b_k(2) - b_j^\dagger(2) b_k(1) \right) \\ &= ig \sum_{j,k} (S_j^+ W_k^- - W_j^+ S_k^-) \end{aligned}$$

where $W^+ = b^\dagger(1) - b^\dagger(2)$, $W^- = b(1) - b(2)$. In the case when $|\vec{w}, M\rangle$ is an eigenvector of the Hamiltonian it can be demonstrated that $C(\mathbf{j}, \vec{w}, M) = 0$. For general states however it is non-zero. In order to evaluate the expectation

value of the current for a general state requires knowing the off-diagonal form factors.

We can use (14) to obtain expressions for off-diagonal form factors for the spin operators. Observe that the inverse problem for the operators S_m^- is easily solved in the present case through

$$S_m^- = \lim_{u \rightarrow \epsilon_m} (u - \epsilon_m) B(u). \quad (17)$$

A consequence is that the following off-diagonal form factors

$$\langle \vec{w}, M | S_m^+ | \vec{v}, M+1 \rangle = \langle \vec{v}, M+1 | S_m^- | \vec{w}, M \rangle$$

can be computed directly from (14). We find the following expression

$$\langle \vec{w}, M+1 | S_m^- | \vec{v}, M \rangle = \frac{\prod_{\beta=1}^{M+1} (w_\beta - \epsilon_m)}{\prod_{\alpha=1}^M (v_\alpha - \epsilon_m)} \frac{\det_{M+1} \mathcal{T}(m, \{w_\beta\}, \{v_\alpha\})}{\prod_{\beta>\alpha} (w_\beta - w_\alpha) \prod_{\beta<\alpha} (v_\beta - v_\alpha)} \quad (18)$$

with the matrix elements of $\mathcal{T}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{ab}(m) &= \prod_{\substack{\alpha=1 \\ \alpha \neq a}}^{M+1} (w_\alpha - v_b) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \frac{2}{(v_b - \epsilon_j)(w_a - \epsilon_j)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\alpha \neq a}^M \frac{2}{(v_b - w_\alpha)(w_a - w_\alpha)} \right), \quad b < M+1, \\ \mathcal{T}_{a,M+1}(m) &= \frac{2}{(w_a - \epsilon_m)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

The problem of obtaining analogous expressions for the operators W_m^+ , W_m^- is not as straightforward and we will return to this problem at a later date. We note that general correlation functions and form factors can be computed using the leading terms in η (quasi-classical limit) of the results derived by Kitanine [32] for the spin 1 Takhtajan-Babujian model.

8. Conclusion.

We have proposed a model describing strong Josephson tunneling in coupled small metallic grains which are described by reduced BCS Hamiltonians. At a particular value of the Josephson coupling energy we have demonstrated that the model becomes integrable, which allows for the exact calculation of the energy spectrum and form factors of the model. We believe that these results will provide insight into the nature of the Josephson effect at the nanoscale level where mean field approaches are not applicable.

Acknowledgements - This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

References

- [1] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 357 (2001).
- [2] D.C. Ralph, C.T. Black and M. Tinkham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 688 (1996); **78**, 4087 (1997).
- [3] J. von Delft and D. C. Ralph, *Phys. Rep.* **345**, 61 (2001); J. von Delft, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **10**, 219 (2001).
- [4] H.T.C. Stoof *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 10 (1996).
- [5] A.G. Truscott *et al.*, *Science* **291**, 2570 (2001).
- [6] R.W. Richardson, *Phys. Lett.* **3**, 277 (1963); **5**, 82 (1963); R.W. Richardson and N. Sherman, *Nucl. Phys.* **52**, 221 (1964); **52**, 253 (1964).
- [7] M.C. Cambiaggio, A.M.F. Rivas and M. Saraceno, *Nucl. Phys.* **A624**, 157 (1997).
- [8] L. Amico and A. Osterloh, cond-mat/0105141.
- [9] H.-Q. Zhou, J. Links, R.H. McKenzie and M.D. Gould, cond-mat/0106390.
- [10] J. von Delft and R. Poghossian, cond-mat/0106405.
- [11] R.W. Richardson, *Phys. Rev.* **144**, 874 (1966).
- [12] J. Links, H.-Q. Zhou, M.D. Gould and R.H. McKenzie, in preparation.
- [13] L. Amico, A.D. Lorenzo and A. Osterloh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5759 (2001); *Nucl. Phys. B* (2001), to be published, cond-mat/0105537.
- [14] J. Dukelsky, C. Eсеbbag and P. Schuck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 066403 (2001).
- [15] For a general introduction to the effect in bulk superconductors see, M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, Second edition, (McGraw Hill, 1996).
- [16] P.W. Anderson, in *Lectures on the many-body problem*, volume 2, edited by E.R. Caianiello, (Academic, New York, 1964), p. 113.

- [17] B.D. Josephson, Phys. Lett. **1**, 251 (1962).
- [18] For a beautiful account of the historical background, see D.G. McDonald, Physics Today **54** (7), 46 (2001).
- [19] V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 486 (1963); erratum **11**, 104 (1963).
- [20] A. J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 307 (2001).
- [21] L.D. Faddeev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A10**, 1845 (1995).
- [22] V.G. Knizhnik and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. **B247**, 83 (1984).
- [23] H.M. Babujian, J. Phys. **A26**, 6981 (1993); H. M. Babujian and R. Flume, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A9**, 2029 (1994).
- [24] P. Christe and R. Flume, Nucl. Phys. **B282**, 466 (1987).
- [25] E. Date *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **4**, 1049 (1990).
- [26] V.V. Schechtman and A.N. Varchenko, Invent. Math. **106**, 139 (1991).
- [27] A. B. Zamolodchikov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A3**, 743 (1988).
- [28] G. Sierra, Nucl. Phys. **B572**, 517 (2000).
- [29] N.A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **79**, 502 (1989).
- [30] V. E. Korepin, N. M. Bogoliubov, and G. Izergin *Quantum inverse scattering method and correlation functions* (Cambridge University Press, 1993, Cambridge).
- [31] N. Kitanine, J.M. Maillet and V. Terras, Nucl. Phys. **B554**, 647 (1999).
- [32] N. Kitanine, math-ph/0104016.